UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

A

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 09/465,514 | 12/16/1999 | HENRY M. GLADNEY | A7254 | 8969 |

7590 12/02/2005

SUGHRUE MION ZINN MACPEAK & SEAS PLLC
2100 PENNSYLVANIA AVENUE N W
WASHINGTON, DC 200373213

| EXAMINER | |
|---|---|
| HA, LEYNNA A | |
| **ART UNIT** | **PAPER NUMBER** |
| 2135 | |

DATE MAILED: 12/02/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

| Office Action Summary | Application No. | Applicant(s) | |
|---|---|---|---|
| | 09/465,514 | GLADNEY, HENRY M. | |
| | Examiner | Art Unit | |
| | LEYNNA T. HA | 2135 | |

*-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --*

**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on _____.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

4)☒ Claim(s) 1-42 is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) 1-42 is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) ☐ Other: _____.

**DETAILED ACTION**

**1.** Claims 1-42 are pending.

**2. In view of the Appeal Brief filed on September 20, 2005, PROSECUTION IS HEREBY REOPENED. A Non-Final Office Action set forth below.**

To avoid abandonment of the application, appellant must exercise one of the following two options:

(1) file a reply under 37 CFR 1.111 (if this Office action is non-final) or a reply under 37 CFR 1.113 (if this Office action is final); or,

(2) initiate a new appeal by filing a notice of appeal under 37 CFR 41.31 followed by an appeal brief under 37 CFR 41.37. The previously paid notice of appeal fee and appeal brief fee can be applied to the new appeal. If, however, the appeal fees set forth in 37 CFR 41.20 have been increased since they were previously paid, then appellant must pay the difference between the increased fees and the amount previously paid.

A Supervisory Patent Examiner (SPE) has approved of reopening prosecution by signing below:

Kim Vu.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

**3. Claims 1-42 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Garg, et al. (US 6,625,603), and further in view of Krishnaswamy, et al. (US 5,974,421).**

**As per claims 1 and 6:**

Garg discloses a storage system comprising a first storage area having an object stored therein and **[see col.6, lines 60-61]** a second storage area having stored therein an object identifier that identifies the object, wherein the object identifier is unique within the storage system **[see col.6, lines 65-67 and col.8, lines 10-15]**. However, Garg fails to discuss the GUID is unique outside of the storage system as well as within the system.

Krishnaswamy teaches an invention for accessing objects located at memory addresses in a memory of a computer system connected to a network connected to remote computer systems wherein uses a mapping technique where it involves GUID (global unique identifier) that converts into an OID

(object identifier) (col.6, lines 5-14). The system wide unique identifier refers to the OID and the network wide unique identifier refers to the GUID where each object has an associated global unique identifier (GUID). Krishnaswamy teach a method to locate the object by using the mapping table which does not teach away from the purpose of the GUID where the GUID is used from one system to another across the network. The OID is merely used for mapping to the location of the object within its system and to save memory space (col.9, lines 41-42), but the GUID is uniquely identified across the network so that it can differentiate one object from all other objects on all other computers on the entire network (col.6, lines 5-8).

The mapping technique will be described herein. The computer system contains a hash table with a plurality of buckets each having entries containing an object identifier for an object and memory address storage information for the object (col.4, lines 10-15). Further, receiving requests for a memory address of the requested object that contains a network-wide unique identifier for the requested object (col.4, lines 29-38). The method then compresses the network wide unique identifier into a system wide unique identifier where the system wide unique identifier is inputted into a hash function to generate an index referring to one of the buckets in the hash table so that the requested objects is matched to the entry in the system wide identifier in order to obtain the memory address storage information to locate the requested object (col.4, lines 35-50). Therefore, Applicant's object identifier

which is unique within and outside of the system is in the form of the GUID of Krishnaswamy where the GUID is unique across the entire network (col.9, lines 11-14).

The GUID will now be explained in further details how it is unique outside the storage system of Krishnaswamy. Figure 3, depicts a data processing system 300 comprising a client computer 302 and a server computer 304 interconnected via a network 306 (col.8, lines 13-18). Hence, Figure 3 describes 2 separate computer systems. The server computer 304 stores database objects that has a number of objects 308 that are utilized and being retrieved by other entities (such computer program on the client computer 302) from the server computer and to load the object into memory so the computer programs of the client computer may access it (col.8, lines 20-32). Figure 4, depicts a client computer 302 comprises a main memory that contains a computer program that accesses the object, object loader, the hash table, and the mapping table (col.8, lines 34-46). When attempting to utilize an object, the computer program has a GUID that identifies the object where the mapping table converts the GUID to an OID to point to the object location (col.8, lines 60-66). The GUID of the object is requested from the server computer (col.11, lines 45-46) and the object loader of the client computer accesses the object using the pointer and compares the GUID contained in the object to the GUID received (col.12, lines 42-45). Thus, the GUID is unique outside of a system and at a remote system.

Therefore, it would have been obvious for a person of ordinary skills in the art to combine the GUID that is unique within the system of Garg, et al., with the GUID that is unique outside the system of Krishnaswamy, et al. because unique identifier can differentiate from one object from all other objects on all other computers on the entire network.

**As per claims 2, 4, 7, and 9: see Garg on col.6, lines 65-67;** discloses the object identifier is a Universal Unique Identifier (UUID).

**As per claims 3 and 8: see Garg on col.5, lines 20-34;** discloses the first and second storage areas are storage areas within a database.

**As per claim 5: see Garg on col.6, line 60 – col.7, line 46;** discloses the storage system is part of an access control system.

**As per claim 10:**

Garg discloses a method of storing information in a storage system, comprising storing an object in the storage system **[see col.6, lines 60-61]** and storing an object identifier in the storage system, wherein the object identifier identifies the object, and the object identifier is unique within the storage system **[see col.6, lines 65-67 and col.8, lines 10-15]**.

However, Garg fails to discuss the GUID is unique outside of the storage system.

Krishnaswamy teaches an invention for accessing objects located at memory addresses in a memory of a computer system connected to a network connected to remote computer systems wherein uses a mapping technique

where it involves GUID (global unique identifier) that converts into an OID (object identifier) (col.6, lines 5-14). The system wide unique identifier refers to the OID and the network wide unique identifier refers to the GUID where each object has an associated global unique identifier (GUID). Krishnaswamy teach a method to locate the object by using the mapping table which does not teach away from the purpose of the GUID where the GUID is used from one system to another across the network. Thus, the GUID is used outside of the system and at a remote system. The OID is merely used for mapping to the location of the object within its system and to save memory space (col.9, lines 41-42), but the GUID is uniquely identified across the network so that it can differentiate one object from all other objects on all other computers on the entire network (col.6, lines 5-8).

The mapping technique will be described herein. The computer system contains a hash table with a plurality of buckets each having entries containing an object identifier for an object and memory address storage information for the object (col.4, lines 10-15). Further, receiving requests for a memory address of the requested object that contains a network-wide unique identifier for the requested object (col.4, lines 29-38). The method then compresses the network wide unique identifier into a system wide unique identifier where the system wide unique identifier is inputted into a hash function to generate an index referring to one of the buckets in the hash table so that the requested objects is matched to the entry in the system wide

identifier in order to obtain the memory address storage information to locate the requested object (col.4, lines 35-50). Therefore, Applicant's object identifier which is unique within and outside of the system is in the form of the GUID of Krishnaswamy where the GUID is unique across the entire network (col.9, lines 11-14).

The GUID will now be explained in further details how it is unique outside the storage system of Krishnaswamy. Figure 3, depicts a data processing system 300 comprising a client computer 302 and a server computer 304 interconnected via a network 306 (col.8, lines 13-18). Hence, Figure 3 describes 2 separate computer systems. The server computer 304 stores database objects that has a number of objects 308 that are utilized and being retrieved by other entities (such computer program on the client computer 302) from the server computer and to load the object into memory so the computer programs of the client computer may access it (col.8, lines 20-32). Figure 4, depicts a client computer 302 comprises a main memory that contains a computer program that accesses the object, object loader, the hash table, and the mapping table (col.8, lines 34-46). When attempting to utilize an object, the computer program has a GUID that identifies the object where the mapping table converts the GUID to an OID to point to the object location (col.8, lines 60-66). The GUID of the object is requested from the server computer (col.11, lines 45-46) and the object loader of the client computer accesses the object using the pointer and compares the GUID contained in the

object to the GUID received (col.12, lines 42-45). Thus, the GUID is unique outside of a system and at a remote system.

Therefore, it would have been obvious for a person of ordinary skills in the art to combine the GUID that is unique within the system of Garg, et al., with the GUID that is unique outside the system of Krishnaswamy, et al. because unique identifier can differentiate from one object from all other objects on all other computers on the entire network.

**As per claims 11, 14, and 15: see Garg on col.6, lines 65-67;** discloses the object identifier is a Universal Unique Identifier (UUID).

**As per claim 12: see Garg on col.6, lines 60-61;** discusses the object is stored in a database.

**As per claim 13: see Garg on col.6, lines 65-67 and col.8, lines 10-15;** discusses the object identifier is stored in a database.

**As per claim 16: see Garg on col.6, line 60 – col.7, line 46;** discloses the storage system is part of an access control system.

**As per claims 17 and 22:**

Garg discloses an access control method comprising:

requesting access for a user to a remote resource **[see col.5 lines 48-50]**, wherein the request includes a subject identifier **[see col.2, lines 19-49]** for use in making an access control decision **[see col.7, lines 26-39]**, and wherein the subject identifier **[see col.12, lines 61-67]** is unique within remote resource **[see col.6, lines 65-67 and col.8, lines 10-15]** and identifies the user **[see col.13,**

**lines 3-19 and col.14, lines 50-54]**. The object in Garg has a GUID where an object defined by the file system service can include properties such as the USERID of the owner of the file. Although, Garg did indicate the GUID has properties such as the USERID, the examiner is providing more obvious evidence the subject identifier such as GUID identifies the user.

Garg fails to discuss the GUID is unique outside of the storage system and identifies the user.

Krishnaswamy teaches an invention for accessing objects located at memory addresses in a memory of a computer system connected to a network connected to remote computer systems wherein uses a mapping technique where it involves GUID (global unique identifier) that converts into an OID (object identifier) (col.6, lines 5-14). The system wide unique identifier refers to the OID and the network wide unique identifier refers to the GUID where each object has an associated global unique identifier (GUID). Krishnaswamy teach a method to locate the object by using the mapping table which does not teach away from the purpose of the GUID where the GUID is used from one system to another across the network. Thus, the GUID is used outside of the system and at a remote system. The OID is merely used for mapping to the location of the object within its system and to save memory space (col.9, lines 41-42), but the GUID is uniquely identified across the network so that it can differentiate one object from all other objects on all other computers on the entire network (col.6, lines 5-8).

The mapping technique will be described herein. The computer system contains a hash table with a plurality of buckets each having entries containing an object identifier for an object and memory address storage information for the object (col.4, lines 10-15). Further, receiving requests for a memory address of the requested object that contains a network-wide unique identifier for the requested object (col.4, lines 29-38). The method then compresses the network wide unique identifier into a system wide unique identifier where the system wide unique identifier is inputted into a hash function to generate an index referring to one of the buckets in the hash table so that the requested objects is matched to the entry in the system wide identifier in order to obtain the memory address storage information to locate the requested object (col.4, lines 35-50). Therefore, Applicant's object identifier which is unique within and outside of the system is in the form of the GUID of Krishnaswamy where the GUID is unique across the entire network (col.9, lines 11-14).

The GUID will now be explained in further details how it is unique outside the storage system of Krishnaswamy. Figure 3, depicts a data processing system 300 comprising a client computer 302 and a server computer 304 interconnected via a network 306 (col.8, lines 13-18). Hence, Figure 3 describes 2 separate computer systems. The server computer 304 stores database objects that has a number of objects 308 that are utilized and being retrieved by other entities (such computer program on the client

computer 302) from the server computer and to load the object into memory so the computer programs of the client computer may access it (col.8, lines 20-32). Krishnaswamy discloses the server (remote) computer stores database objects like records, fields of a record, or table and that one skilled in the art will appreciate the techniques can be utilized with other types of objects (col.8, lines 26-27). In addition, the objects can be created to relate to employee information which is users (col. 9, lines 16-27). Figure 4, depicts a client computer 302 comprises a main memory that contains a computer program that accesses the object, object loader, the hash table, and the mapping table (col.8, lines 34-46). When attempting to utilize an object, the computer program has a GUID that identifies the object where the mapping table converts the GUID to an OID to point to the object location (col.8, lines 60-66). The GUID of the object is requested from the server computer (col.11, lines 45-46) and the object loader of the client computer accesses the object using the pointer and compares the GUID contained in the object to the GUID received (col.12, lines 42-45). Thus, the GUID is unique outside of a system and at a remote system.

Therefore, it would have been obvious for a person of ordinary skills in the art to combine the GUID of Garg, et al., with the GUID that identifies the user of Krishnaswamy, et al. because by being able to apply the GUID for more than just one type of object can further enhance the type of access control by

categorizing the different types of objects such as applications, users, and resources. (col.9, lines 16-27)

Further, it would have been obvious for a person of ordinary skills in the art to combine the GUID that is unique within the system of Garg, et al., with the GUID that is unique outside the system of Krishnaswamy, et al. because unique identifier can differentiate from one object from all other objects on all other computers on the entire network.

**As per claims 18 and 23: see Garg on col.6, lines 65-67;** discloses the object identifier is a Universal Unique Identifier (UUID).

**As per claim 19: see Garg on see col.8, lines 23-43;** discusses the request further includes a subject descriptor for use in the access control decision.

**As per claim 20: see Garg on col.6, lines 65-67 and see Krishnaswamy on col. 9, lines 16-27;** discloses the subject descriptor is a UUID for an organizational structure that includes the user.

**As per claim 21:** Garg discusses the access control decision is made by a resource manager that protects the remote resource **[see col.7, lines 7-20]**, and the request is sent over a communications path considered safe by the protecting resource manager and the user. **[see col.7, lines 26-29 and col.8, lines 23-44]**

**As per claim 24:**

Garg discloses a method of identifying a user requesting access to an object, comprising:

establishing a secure communication path between a reference monitor protecting the object and a resource manager **[see col.7, lines 7-25]** having information describing the user, in response to a request by the user to access the object; **[see col.6, lines 65-67 and col.8, lines 10-15]**.

sending a request for user information from the protecting reference monitor to the resource manager **[see col.7, lines 26-39]**, the request including a subject descriptor for the user **[see col.8, lines 23-43 and col.13, line 42 – col.14, line 30]**, wherein the subject identifier is a Universal Unique Identifier (UUID). **[see col.13, lines 3-19 and col.14, lines 50-54]**

The object in Garg has a GUID where an object defined by the file system service can include properties such as the USERID of the owner of the file. Although, Garg did indicate the GUID has properties such as the USERID, the examiner is providing more obvious evidence the request for the subject descriptor such as GUID is for the user.

Garg fails to discuss the GUID is unique outside of the storage system.

Krishnaswamy teaches an invention for accessing objects located at memory addresses in a memory of a computer system connected to a network connected to remote computer systems wherein uses a mapping technique where it involves GUID (global unique identifier) that converts into an OID

(object identifier) (col.6, lines 5-14). The system wide unique identifier refers to the OID and the network wide unique identifier refers to the GUID where each object has an associated global unique identifier (GUID). Krishnaswamy teach a method to locate the object by using the mapping table which does not teach away from the purpose of the GUID where the GUID is used from one system to another across the network. Thus, the GUID is used outside of the system and at a remote system. The OID is merely used for mapping to the location of the object within its system and to save memory space (col.9, lines 41-42), but the GUID is uniquely identified across the network so that it can differentiate one object from all other objects on all other computers on the entire network (col.6, lines 5-8).

The mapping technique will be described herein. The computer system contains a hash table with a plurality of buckets each having entries containing an object identifier for an object and memory address storage information for the object (col.4, lines 10-15). Further, receiving requests for a memory address of the requested object that contains a network-wide unique identifier for the requested object (col.4, lines 29-38). The method then compresses the network wide unique identifier into a system wide unique identifier where the system wide unique identifier is inputted into a hash function to generate an index referring to one of the buckets in the hash table so that the requested objects is matched to the entry in the system wide identifier in order to obtain the memory address storage information to locate

the requested object (col.4, lines 35-50). Therefore, Applicant's object identifier which is unique within and outside of the system is in the form of the GUID of Krishnaswamy where the GUID is unique across the entire network (col.9, lines 11-14).

The GUID will now be explained in further details how it is unique outside the storage system of Krishnaswamy. Figure 3, depicts a data processing system 300 comprising a client computer 302 and a server computer 304 interconnected via a network 306 (col.8, lines 13-18). Hence, Figure 3 describes 2 separate computer systems. The server computer 304 stores database objects that has a number of objects 308 that are utilized and being retrieved by other entities (such computer program on the client computer 302) from the server computer and to load the object into memory so the computer programs of the client computer may access it (col.8, lines 20-32). Krishnaswamy discloses the server (remote) computer stores database objects like records, fields of a record, or table and that one skilled in the art will appreciate the techniques can be utilized with other types of objects (col.8, lines 26-27). In addition, the objects can be created to relate to employee information which is users (col. 9, lines 16-27). Figure 4, depicts a client computer 302 comprises a main memory that contains a computer program that accesses the object, object loader, the hash table, and the mapping table (col.8, lines 34-46). When attempting to utilize an object, the computer program has a GUID that identifies the object where the mapping table

converts the GUID to an OID to point to the object location (col.8, lines 60-66). The GUID of the object is requested from the server computer (col.11, lines 45-46) and the object loader of the client computer accesses the object using the pointer and compares the GUID contained in the object to the GUID received (col.12, lines 42-45). Thus, the GUID is unique outside of a system and at a remote system.

Therefore, it would have been obvious for a person of ordinary skills in the art to combine the GUID of Garg, et al., with the GUID that identifies the user of Krishnaswamy, et al. because by being able to apply the GUID for more than just one type of object can further enhance the type of access control by categorizing the different types of objects such as applications, users, and resources. (col.9, lines 16-27)

Further, it would have been obvious for a person of ordinary skills in the art to combine the GUID that is unique within the system of Garg, et al., with the GUID that is unique outside the system of Krishnaswamy, et al. because unique identifier can differentiate from one object from all other objects on all other computers on the entire network.

**As per claim 25: see Garg col.8 lines 45-53 and see Krishnaswamy on col. 9, lines 16-27;** discloses determining, based on the received user information, if the user has permission to access the requested object.

**As per claim 26: see Garg on col.14 lines 50-54 and see Krishnaswamy on col. 9, lines 16-27;** discussing the user information includes information relating to an organization of which the user is member.

**As per claims 27 and 30:**

Garg discloses an information storage management system, comprising:

a collection of stored objects; **[see col.6, lines 60-61]**

an access control unit for determining if a requestor is authorized to access a protected object stored in the collection; **[see col.7 lines 26-39]**

a resource manager connected to the access control unit and to a communication channel; **[see col.4, lines 51-55]**

wherein the resource manager receives a user's request for access to the protected object, the request including a globally unique identifier for the user requesting the access **[see col.8, lines 44-50]**,

wherein the resource manager upon receiving a response including user information about the user passes the user information **[see col.13, line 42 – col.14, line 30]** to the access control unit **[see col.7 lines 6-60]**; and

based on the user information the access control unit determines whether to grant the subject access to the protected object. **[see col.14, lines 13-30]**

The object in Garg has a GUID where an object defined by the file system service can include properties such as the USERID of the owner of the file. Although, Garg did indicate the GUID has properties such as the USERID, the

examiner is providing more obvious evidence of the request for the information such as GUID is about the user.

Garge fails to discuss the globally unique identifier for the user is sent to an external storage management system a request for information about the user.

Krishnaswamy teaches an invention for accessing objects located at memory addresses in a memory of a computer system connected to a network connected to remote computer systems wherein uses a mapping technique where it involves GUID (global unique identifier) that converts into an OID (object identifier) (col.6, lines 5-14). The system wide unique identifier refers to the OID and the network wide unique identifier refers to the GUID where each object has an associated global unique identifier (GUID). Krishnaswamy teach a method to locate the object by using the mapping table which does not teach away from the purpose of the GUID where the GUID is used from one system to another across the network. Thus, the GUID is used outside of the system and at a remote system. The OID is merely used for mapping to the location of the object within its system and to save memory space (col.9, lines 41-42), but the GUID is uniquely identified across the network so that it can differentiate one object from all other objects on all other computers on the entire network (col.6, lines 5-8).

The mapping technique will be described herein. The computer system contains a hash table with a plurality of buckets each having entries

containing an object identifier for an object and memory address storage information for the object (col.4, lines 10-15). Further, receiving requests for a memory address of the requested object that contains a network-wide unique identifier for the requested object (col.4, lines 29-38). The method then compresses the network wide unique identifier into a system wide unique identifier where the system wide unique identifier is inputted into a hash function to generate an index referring to one of the buckets in the hash table so that the requested objects is matched to the entry in the system wide identifier in order to obtain the memory address storage information to locate the requested object (col.4, lines 35-50). Therefore, Applicant's object identifier which is unique within and outside of the system is in the form of the GUID of Krishnaswamy where the GUID is unique across the entire network (col.9, lines 11-14).

The GUID will now be explained in further details how it is unique outside the storage system of Krishnaswamy. Figure 3, depicts a data processing system 300 comprising a client computer 302 and a server computer 304 interconnected via a network 306 (col.8, lines 13-18). Hence, Figure 3 describes 2 separate computer systems. The server computer 304 stores database objects that has a number of objects 308 that are utilized and being retrieved by other entities (such computer program on the client computer 302) from the server computer and to load the object into memory so the computer programs of the client computer may access it (col.8, lines 20-

32). Krishnaswamy discloses the server (remote) computer stores database objects like records, fields of a record, or table and that one skilled in the art will appreciate the techniques can be utilized with other types of objects (col.8, lines 26-27). In addition, the objects can be created to relate to employee information which is users (col. 9, lines 16-27). Figure 4, depicts a client computer 302 comprises a main memory that contains a computer program that accesses the object, object loader, the hash table, and the mapping table (col.8, lines 34-46). When attempting to utilize an object, the computer program has a GUID that identifies the object where the mapping table converts the GUID to an OID to point to the object location (col.8, lines 60-66). The GUID of the object is requested from the server computer (col.11, lines 45-46) and the object loader of the client computer accesses the object using the pointer and compares the GUID contained in the object to the GUID received (col.12, lines 42-45). Thus, the GUID is unique outside of a system and at a remote system.

Therefore, it would have been obvious for a person of ordinary skills in the art to combine the GUID of Garg, et al., with the GUID that identifies the user of Krishnaswamy, et al. because by being able to apply the GUID for more than just one type of object can further enhance the type of access control by categorizing the different types of objects such as applications, users, and resources. (col.9, lines 16-27)

Further, it would have been obvious for a person of ordinary skills in the art to combine the GUID that is unique within the system of Garg, et al., with the GUID that is unique outside the system of Krishnaswamy, et al. because unique identifier can differentiate from one object from all other objects on all other computers on the entire network.

**As per claims 28 and 31: see Garg on col.6, lines 65-67;** discloses the globally unique identifier is a Universal Unique Identifier (UUID). the is a Universal Unique Identifier (UUID).

**As per claims 29 and 32: see Garg on col.14 lines 50-54 and see Krishnaswamy on col. 9, lines 16-27;** discloses the user information is organization information indicating whether the user is a member of an organization.

**As per claim 33: see Garg on col.6, lines 46-53 and see Krishnaswamy on col.6, lines 5-14;** discloses the resource manager resolves the globally unique identifier by using a name server.

**As per claims 34 and 36:**

Garg discloses a method of accessing a protected object, comprising:

sending a globally unique identifier for a user **[see col.8, lines 13-21]** to a name resolving device, and receiving therefrom information about the user; and **[see col.13, lines 3-67]**

sending to a storage management system containing an object a request for access to the object **[see col.6, lines 60-61]**, the request including the information about the user **[see col.7 lines 26-39 and col.14, lines 1-15]**.

The object in Garg has a GUID where an object defined by the file system service can include properties such as the USERID of the owner of the file. Although, Garg did indicate the GUID has properties such as the USERID, the examiner is providing more obvious evidence of the GUID of an object can apply for a user.

Garge fails to discuss the request including a globally unique identifier for the user sent to an external storage management system a request for information about the user.

Krishnaswamy teaches an invention for accessing objects located at memory addresses in a memory of a computer system connected to a network connected to remote computer systems wherein uses a mapping technique where it involves GUID (global unique identifier) that converts into an OID (object identifier) (col.6, lines 5-14). The system wide unique identifier refers to the OID and the network wide unique identifier refers to the GUID where each object has an associated global unique identifier (GUID). Krishnaswamy teach a method to locate the object by using the mapping table which does not teach away from the purpose of the GUID where the GUID is used from one system to another across the network. Thus, the GUID is used outside of the system and at a remote system. The OID is merely used for mapping to the location of the

object within its system and to save memory space (col.9, lines 41-42), but the GUID is uniquely identified across the network so that it can differentiate one object from all other objects on all other computers on the entire network (col.6, lines 5-8).

The mapping technique will be described herein. The computer system contains a hash table with a plurality of buckets each having entries containing an object identifier for an object and memory address storage information for the object (col.4, lines 10-15). Further, receiving requests for a memory address of the requested object that contains a network-wide unique identifier for the requested object (col.4, lines 29-38). The method then compresses the network wide unique identifier into a system wide unique identifier where the system wide unique identifier is inputted into a hash function to generate an index referring to one of the buckets in the hash table so that the requested objects is matched to the entry in the system wide identifier in order to obtain the memory address storage information to locate the requested object (col.4, lines 35-50). Therefore, Applicant's object identifier which is unique within and outside of the system is in the form of the GUID of Krishnaswamy where the GUID is unique across the entire network (col.9, lines 11-14).

The GUID will now be explained in further details how it is unique outside the storage system of Krishnaswamy. Figure 3, depicts a data processing system 300 comprising a client computer 302 and a server

computer 304 interconnected via a network 306 (col.8, lines 13-18). Hence, Figure 3 describes 2 separate computer systems. The server computer 304 stores database objects that has a number of objects 308 that are utilized and being retrieved by other entities (such computer program on the client computer 302) from the server computer and to load the object into memory so the computer programs of the client computer may access it (col.8, lines 20-32). Krishnaswamy discloses the server (remote) computer stores database objects like records, fields of a record, or table and that one skilled in the art will appreciate the techniques can be utilized with other types of objects (col.8, lines 26-27). In addition, the objects can be created to relate to employee information which is users (col. 9, lines 16-27). Figure 4, depicts a client computer 302 comprises a main memory that contains a computer program that accesses the object, object loader, the hash table, and the mapping table (col.8, lines 34-46). When attempting to utilize an object, the computer program has a GUID that identifies the object where the mapping table converts the GUID to an OID to point to the object location (col.8, lines 60-66). The GUID of the object is requested from the server computer (col.11, lines 45-46) and the object loader of the client computer accesses the object using the pointer and compares the GUID contained in the object to the GUID received (col.12, lines 42-45). Thus, the GUID is unique outside of a system and at a remote system.

Therefore, it would have been obvious for a person of ordinary skills in the art to combine the GUID of Garg, et al., with the GUID that identifies the user of Krishnaswamy, et al. because by being able to apply the GUID for more than just one type of object can further enhance the type of access control by categorizing the different types of objects such as applications, users, and resources. (col.9, lines 16-27)

Further, it would have been obvious for a person of ordinary skills in the art to combine the GUID that is unique within the system of Garg, et al., with the GUID that is unique outside the system of Krishnaswamy, et al. because unique identifier can differentiate from one object from all other objects on all other computers on the entire network.

**As per claims 35 and 37: see Garg on col.6, lines 65-67;** discloses the globally unique identifier is a Universal Unique Identifier (UUID).

**As per claims 38 and 39: see Garg on col.8 lines 5-36**; wherein object is a database record describing a user.

**As per claim 40: see Garg on col.8 lines 5-36**; wherein object is a database record describing a user.

**As per claims 41 and 42:**

Garg discusses the subject identifier identifies a database record describing the user **[col.8 lines 5-36]** , and the database record is stored on a local resource **[see col.6, lines 65-67 and col.8, lines 10-15]** physically separate from the remote resource **[see col.4, lines 50-55]**. The object in Garg has a

GUID where an object defined by the file system service can include properties such as the USERID of the owner of the file. Although, Garg did indicate the GUID has properties such as the USERID, the examiner is providing more obvious evidence of the subject identifier is the GUID that identifies a database record describing the user.

Krishnaswamy teaches an invention for accessing objects located at memory addresses in a memory of a computer system connected to a network connected to remote computer systems. The GUID is uniquely identified across the network so that it can differentiate one object from all other objects on all other computers on the entire network (col.6, lines 5-8). Krishnaswamy discloses the server (remote) computer stores database objects like records, fields of a record, or table and that one skilled in the art will appreciate the techniques can be utilized with other types of objects (col.8, lines 26-27). In addition, the objects can be created to relate to employee information which is users (col. 9, lines 16-27). Figure 4, depicts a client computer comprises a main memory that contains a computer program that accesses the object, object loader, the hash table, the mapping table, and various objects (col.8, lines 34-46). The GUID of the object is requested from the server computer (col.11, lines 45-46) and the object loader of the client computer accesses the object using the pointer and compares the GUID contained in the object to the GUID received (col.12, lines 42-45). Hence, the database record is stored on

local resource (client computer) physically separate from the remote resource (server computer).

Therefore, it would have been obvious for a person of ordinary skills in the art to combine the GUID of Garg, et al., with the GUID that identifies the user of Krishnaswamy, et al. because by being able to apply the GUID for more than just one type of object can further enhance the type of access control by categorizing the different types of objects such as applications, users, and resources. (col.9, lines 16-27)

***Conclusion***

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to LEYNNA T. HA whose telephone number is (571) 272-3851. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Thursday (7:00 - 5:00PM).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Kim Vu can be reached on (571) 272-3859. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

LHa

KIM VU
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100